

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
United States Attorney  
BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)  
Chief, Criminal Division  
STACEY P. GEIS (CASBN 181444)  
JONATHAN SCHMIDT (CABSBN 230646)  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
450 Golden Gate Ave., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 436-6776 (tel)  
(415) 436-7234 (fax)  
[Jonathan.Schmidt@usdoj.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Schmidt@usdoj.gov)

RONALD J. TENPAS  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environment and Natural Resources Division  
United States Department of Justice  
Richard A. Udell  
Senior Trial Attorney  
Environmental Crimes Section  
P.O. Box 23985  
L'Enfant Plaza Station  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 305-0361 (tel)  
(202) 514-8865 (fax)  
[Richard.Udell@usdoj.gov](mailto:Richard.Udell@usdoj.gov)

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR 08-0160 SI
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	[Proposed] ORDER SETTING DATES and
	)	EXCLUDING TIME FROM AUGUST 7,
JOHN JOSEPH COTA,	)	2008 to SEPTEMBER 18, 2008
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

On August 7, 2008, the parties appeared before the Court and set the following dates

- August 18, 2008 The Government will provide full discovery.
- September 2, 2008 The Government will provide relevant expert reports.
- September 2, 2008 Material witness counsel will file any submissions.
- September 12, 2008 by noon Defense Counsel and will file a submission <sup>regarding - JCS</sup> ~~stating their proceed-~~  
~~with~~ Rule 15 depositions; the Government may file a submission
- September 18, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. Hearing regarding Rule 15 depositions
- October 1, 2008 Rule 15 depositions Liang Xian Zheng
- October 3, 2008 Rule 15 depositions Zong Bin Li

At that appearance, the parties agreed that the period of delay from AUGUST 7, 2008 2008, to September 18, 2008, be excluded in computing the time within which the trial must commence. The grounds for this exclusion are the complexity of the case, and the need for the parties to exchange and review further discovery. Failure to grant such a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant and the government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv). Further the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/15/08

